

AMERICAN MILLENARIAN AND PROPHETIC REVIEW.

ISAAC P. LABAGH, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

VOL. II.

NEW YORK, JULY 1, 1843.

No. 2.

CHRIST'S KINGDOM ON EARTH.

[Continued from page 7.]

Leaving this, then, for the serious consideration of all, we proceed to prove, by a regular chain of evidence, that, with respect to the Redeemer's future coming, nothing but a personal coming to reign upon earth can fulfil the Scriptures which are written of him. You will, of course, bear in mind that the question is not concerning the *fact* of the *personal* coming of our Lord—which no Christian doubts—but concerning the *purpose* and *effect* of it. Those who oppose the doctrine of the Personal Reign on Earth, imagine that Christ will come to destroy the present habitable globe, and to carry away his saints with him to some abode of blessedness in another part of the creation. We, on the contrary, maintain, that He will come to remain in it, to restore it, to establish it, to cause to inherit its desolate heritages, to sit upon the throne of David and upon his kingdom, and to order it with judgment and with justice for ever.

With the purpose of establishing this latter view, we shall, in what follows, examine closely the promises made by God to Abraham, to give to him, and to his seed after him, the land of Canaan for an inheritance. If it can be proved that these promises are yet unfulfilled, there is but one conclusion to which a believer in the word of God can come; namely, that they shall yet receive, in every particular, a literal and exact fulfilment.

Let us, then, turn to the several passages of Scripture in which these promises are contained.

And, first (Gen. xii.): "Now the Lord had said unto Abram, Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, into a land that I will shew thee....and they," namely, Abram and his family, "went forth to go into the land of Canaan; and into the land of Canaan they came.....And the Lord appeared unto Abram, and said, Unto thy seed will I give this land."—Again (Gen. xiii.), "And the Lord said unto Abram.....Lift up now thine eyes, and look from the place where thou art, northward, and southward, and eastward, and westward: for all the land *which thou seest*, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed for ever. And I will make thy seed as the dust of the earth (i. e. in number).....Arise, walk through the land in the length of it and in the breadth of it; for *I will give it unto thee*." Again (Gen. xv. 18), "In the same day the Lord made a covenant with Abram, saying, Unto thy seed have I given this land, from the river of Egypt

unto the great river, the river Euphrates." Again (Gen. xvii. 8), "And I will give unto *thee*, and to *thy seed after thee*, all the land of Canaan for an *everlasting possession*; and I will be their God."

Now let us examine these promises of the living and true God, in their several particulars, briefly, but closely, and in due order.—1. The subject of promise is a certain country, by name the land of Canaan. 2. Its extent is, from the river of Egypt to the great river, the river Euphrates. 3. The promise of it, as an inheritance, is made to certain persons—namely, first to *Abraham himself** (mark that), and afterwards to his seed after him. 4. Their possession of it was to be "for ever"—it was to be "an everlasting possession."

Now the point which I am about to examine is this; Have these promises been yet perfectly fulfilled in any one of these particulars? I say *perfectly*, because I do not deny that there has been a partial fulfilment, in some respects, as an earnest and foretaste of the complete and final accomplishment. The question is, Has any one particular been *perfectly* fulfilled? If not, my point is gained; for the promises will then remain *to be fulfilled*: and fulfilled they shall be; for we are not only warranted in believing, but are absolutely bound to believe, that every particular will be exactly accomplished. "God is not a man, that he should lie; neither the son of man, that he should repent: hath He said, and shall he not do it? Hath He spoken, and shall he not make it good?"

1. First, then, have they been fulfilled to *Abraham himself*?—St. Stephen, in his address to the Jewish council (Act vii. 2—5), expressly

* The learned Joseph Mede makes use of this fact, for a different purpose, in his answer to Dr. Twiss's Fourth Letter. "I doubt not," he says, "but you have felt some scruple (as well as others) at our Saviour's demonstration of *the resurrection* in the Gospel. (Matt. xxii.; Mark xii.) God said to Moses in the bush, 'I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob: God is not the God of the dead, but of the living.' Ergo, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, must one day rise again from the dead. How does this conclusion follow? Do not the *spirits* of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, yet live? God should then be the God of the living, though their bodies should never rise again. Therefore some Socinians argue from this place, that the spirits of the just lie in the sleep of death until the resurrection. Or might not the Sadducees have replied, the meaning to be of what God *had been*, not of what he *should be*; namely, that he was that God who had once chosen their fathers, and made covenant with them: 'I am the God that brought Abraham out of Chaldee; who appeared to Isaac and Jacob whilst they lived,' &c. But how would this, then, make for *the resurrection*? Surely it doth: He that could not err said it. Let us therefore see how it may. I say, therefore, the words must be understood with supply of that they have reference to; which is, the covenant the Lord made with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; in respect whereof he calls himself *their God*. This covenant was, to give unto them, and to their seed, the land wherein they were strangers: (mark it) Not to *their seed*, or *offsprings, only*, but to *themselves*, Vide loco: to Abraham, Gen. xiii. 15, xv. 7, xvii. 8; to Isaac, Gen. xxvi. 3; to Jacob, Gen. xxxiv. 12; to all these, Exod. vi. 4—8, Deut. i. 8, xi. 20, xxx. 20. If God, then, make good to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, this his *covenant*, whereby he undertook to be *their God*, then they must needs one day live again to inherit the promised land, which hitherto they have not done: for the God that thus covenanted with them, covenanted not to make his promise good to them *dead*, but *living*. This is the strength of the Divine argument, and irrefragable; which otherwise would not infer any such conclusion."

says that "the Lord gave him *none inheritance* in" the land, "no, not so much as to set his foot on : *yet he promised* that he *would* give it to him for a possession, and to his seed after him, when as yet he had no child." St. Paul also declares (Heb. xi., which contains a long catalogue of ancient worthies, who were sustained under all their sufferings by faith in the promise, but who died without receiving it), that he (i. e. Abraham) "died in faith, *not having received the promise*." We can only, therefore, choose between two alternatives : Abraham shall yet receive it, or God will be found *unfaithful*, who promised.

I think Exod. vi. 2—4 is a very important passage in reference to this question : "And God spake unto Moses, and said unto him, I am the Lord : and I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, by the name of God Almighty ; but by my name Jehovah was I not known unto them. And I have also established my covenant with them, to give them the land of Canaan, the land of their pilgrimage, wherein they were strangers." Here, then, we see that God represents the covenant that he had made with Abraham, to give unto *Abraham himself* the literal Canaan, as being still in force. The words are not spoken indefinitely, "I *did* establish my covenant with them (i. e. Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob), once upon a time : and some time or other I will fulfil it, by giving the land to their descendants ;" but definitely and distinctly : "I *have* established my covenant with *them*, to give *them* the land of Canaan." Now, this was spoken more than three hundred years after Abraham's death ; and still God saith, "I *have established* my covenant with *them*, to give *them*"—What ? the heavenly Canaan ?—meaning thereby a glorious abode in another part of the creation ? *Nay*. It will indeed be *heavenly* in one sense, for the curse will have been removed, and Christ will be there ; but it will be the *actual Canaan*, "the land of their pilgrimage, the land in which they were strangers." St. Paul says, in the same chapter of Hebrews to which I have already referred, "By faith, Abraham, when he was called to go out into a place *which he should after receive for an inheritance*, obeyed ;" and in faith he died, "*seeing the promise afar off*, and being *persuaded* of it," but "*not having received*" it ; and therefore he must come back to receive it ; for this promise to him, of the literal Canaan for his inheritance, stands to this day an unfulfilled promise in the pages of the sacred volume.

2. In the next place, have they been fulfilled to the seed ?—Neither Isaac nor Jacob, the immediate descendants of Abraham, received the promises. During Abraham's life-time they "dwelt with him in tabernacles ;" "*heirs* with him of the same promise," but never *possessors* of it ; for "these all died in faith, not having received the promise" (Heb. xi.) But it may be asked, Did not his more remote descendants, after the Egyptian captivity, actually inherit the promise ? I reply, they did not in the time of Joshua (see Josh. xiii.) ; they did not in the whole of the time (four hundred years) which intervened between Joshua and David. Even in the time of David and Solomon, the most glorious time which Israel yet has known, it appears to me very doubtful wheth-

er they really possessed the land to the full *extent* of the promise. This was, "from the river of Egypt to the great river, the river Euphrates." Now, if the promise, as respects *extent of territory*, was not fulfilled in the time of Solomon, it has undoubtedly never yet been fulfilled at all. But what say the Scriptures on the subject? It is written concerning Solomon (1 Kings iv. 21—24), that he "reigned over all kingdoms from the river (Euphrates) unto the land of the Philistines, and unto the border of Egypt.....he had dominion over all the region on this side of the river, from Tiphseh, even to Azzah (Gaza), over all the kings on this side the river." And again (2 Chron. ix. 26), "And he reigned over all the kings from the river even unto the land of the Philistines, and to the border of Egypt." In reference to the first of these texts, Gaza was a considerable distance *short of* the "river of Egypt," which is generally supposed to be the eastern or Pelusiatic branch of the Nile; and as to the other, if we are to understand by the expression "unto the land of the Philistines," that this land was exempted from his dominion, then Solomon did *not* possess the land "from the river of Egypt to the great river, the river Euphrates." It seems therefore very doubtful, to say the least, whether the Israelites ever possessed the land to the full *extent* promised.*

But were it even admitted that they *did* possess the land promised, as to *extent*, there can be no doubt that they did not as to *duration*. This promised land was to be "an *everlasting* possession," to Abraham and to his seed. But, if ever inherited *fully* by his descendants (which I believe not to have been the case), for how short a time was it in their actual possession! Even in the time of Rehoboam, Solomon's son, Shishak, king of Egypt, took and spoiled Jerusalem (1 Kings xiv. 25). And, to say nothing of the frequent reverses of Israel in the intermediate period, in about two hundred and fifty years after Solomon's death the Assyrian king carried the Ten Tribes captive, and put an end to the kingdom of Israel (2 Kings xviii. 10—12). And within one hundred and fifty years after that, Nebuchadnezzar took and destroyed Jerusalem, and carried the people of Judah captive to Babylon; since which time it certainly will not be pretended that the Jews who returned from that captivity ever possessed the inheritance to its full extent. Indeed, for nearly two thousand years they have been cast out of it altogether, wanderers over the whole earth, whilst Jerusalem, the holy city, has been trodden under foot of the Gentiles.

But supposing, even, that the Israelites had been put in full possession of the promised land, and had kept possession of it to this very day, my argument would not be affected. For I assert, on the authority of St. Paul (Gal. iii. 16), that (although the Israelites had certainly an interest in the promise) they were not *the Seed* to whom that promise was *especially* made. "To Abraham and his seed were the promises made; he

* The map of the dominions of David and Solomon, which accompanies the Family Bible of the Society for promoting Christian Knowledge, and which is doubtless compiled from the best authorities, makes them fall considerably short of the river of Egypt.

saith not, And to seeds, as of many ; but as of one, And to thy Seed, which is Christ." Here, then, we are assured, by an inspired commentator, that Christ was the Seed to whom the promise (of an inheritance, ver. 18) was especially made ; and not either Isaac or Jacob (although it was also renewed to them personally), or their descendants, the Jews. The promise, then, has never yet been fulfilled, either to Abraham or *the Seed* ; for it will hardly be pretended that Christ has yet had any inheritance in the land of Canaan. When he appeared there, he appeared "in the form of a servant ;" was born in a common stable, lived a life of suffering, had not where to lay his head, was rejected, persecuted, scourged, spit upon, cast out, and crucified as a malefactor, between two thieves.

I think, then, it has been fairly proved, that the promise of Canaan, as an inheritance, has never yet been made good either to Abraham or to the Seed. If, therefore, Christ, the Seed, immediately upon his return, destroy that which was promised as the inheritance, how can the promise ever be fulfilled at all ? How can it, in short, be otherwise fulfilled than by the return of Christ and his saints to take possession of it, and reign over it for ever ? May I not affirm, therefore, that the point is fairly established, which I undertook to prove—namely, that nothing but a personal coming of the Redeemer to reign upon the earth can fulfil the Scriptures which are written concerning him ?

THE STUDY OF PROPHECY.

The following extract from an Address, delivered by the Rev. J. W. Brooks, Vicar of Clareboro, England, to the Clergy of Bath, and the Society for promoting Christianity among the Jews, contains some remarks so solemn and just that we earnestly hope every reader of them will take pains to rehearse them in the hearing of those who reverence the word of God, but have fallen into some of those popular errors in relation to the Prophetical parts of it which have so extensively prevailed :

Permit me, then, first to observe, that it is part of our especial duty, as ministers and stewards of God's word, to endeavor to make ourselves acquainted with the *prophetical* portions of that word, equally with every other part of divine revelation. If we would know what expectations ought to be entertained in regard to the Jews ;—if we would inquire what is likely to be the result of our efforts to evangelize the heathen ;—if we would understand the present position and the future prospects of the Church of Christ ;—for information on all or any of these topics, we must turn to the "sure word of prophecy."

The increase of interest manifested in this city (Bath) for the cause of Israel, leads me to infer that some among you must already have given attention to the study of the prophetic Scriptures ; for I generally observe that a proper acquaintance with the revealed purposes of God concerning his ancient people has a considerable influence in stirring up believers to greater diligence and devotedness in their behalf. But all

are not equally persuaded in this matter ; for I still meet with many, even among pious Christians, who appear to forget what the *Scriptures* say of prophecy, viz., that it is a light whereunto we do well that we take heed, (2 Peter i. 19 ;) and to conclude that they do *better* by putting that light under a bushel ; who forget also the blessing pronounced in the Apocalypse on *him that readeth*, (by whom I understand the *minister*, who sits in the seat of Christ,) and on *them that hear* the words of that prophecy ;—shewing that these things were intended for public ministration, as well as for private investigation. (Rev. i. 3.)

I am reminded here of what was once stated to me by a minister of the Gospel, who had been much opposed to the study of prophecy, but who, at the time I speak of, was led, through God's mercy, to take a lively interest therein. Conversing with him on his former prejudices, and expressing my surprise that he, who had been a zealous advocate for Christians being rooted and grounded in the knowledge of holy writ,—who had even adopted as his motto, "*The Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible,*"—should never have felt how inconsistent it was with his advocacy of a *whole Bible*, to recommend the abstaining from the study of so large a portion of it as that which may be comprehended under the term *prophecy* ; he replied nearly as follows : "Ah ! you now bring my sin to my remembrance. I will tell you the honest truth. I found some of my people beforehand with me in the investigation of prophecy, and beginning to ply me with hard questions on the subject. I felt conscious that I knew little or nothing about the matter ; and I had neither time nor inclination to enter upon the study, which then appeared to me a more formidable undertaking than I have since found it to be : so I took the shorter method of discountenancing the subject altogether." Such was my friend's candid avowal. I have since discovered that his case is by no means singular, and that others have in like manner abused their ministerial influence and incurred a like measure of ministerial responsibility. Let us therefore, dear brethren, bear in remembrance the warnings which we have of the danger of neglecting prophecy ;—that our Lord charged the Pharisees with *hypocrisy* because they knew not the signs of the times, (Matt. xvi. 3 ;)—which signs could only be known from prophecy ;—and that St. Paul ascribes the awful sin of the Jews, in condemning the Lord of glory, to the fact that they knew not the *voices* of the prophets which were read every sabbath day, (Acts xiii. 27 ;)—a manifest proof that the *reading* of prophecy, or the hearing it read, is not sufficient of itself ; but that we must endeavor to understand its *voice* or meaning.

I am far from meaning to assert that the knowledge of those prophetic truths, which relate to the glory to be revealed, are *essential to salvation*, in the same manner that certain fundamental doctrines of the Scriptures must be viewed. Nevertheless, it is impossible for any individual to say to what extent the belief of prophetic truth may prove a means of aiding him to fight the good fight of faith, and to deaden his affections in regard to this present world. For, indeed, the things to be hoped for are so interwoven in the Scriptures with the general doctrines

and precepts of holy writ, that it is impossible to disregard the one without at the same time destroying the harmony and weakening the power of the other. It is also evident, that if we are not sufficiently acquainted with prophecy, we are in danger of giving countenance to error, and of promoting delusion instead of sober truth among God's people; which is, nevertheless, often done in the public advocacy of our Evangelical institutions.

I will first instance the Missionary cause, which is represented by some of our public advocates, as if the agency at present employed were to be the means of gradually effecting the complete conversion of the world; their doctrine being as the little leaven put into the unholy lump, and increasing and multiplying converts, who again are to go forth, and in their turns to convert an equal number, until, by a sort of geometrical progression, the whole shall be leavened. Now such an expectation arises from a superficial acquaintance with the truths of prophecy. There doubtless are passages which speak of a future period of great prosperity and glory for the Church, when "the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the glory of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea." (Hab. ii. 14.) But such passages will be found combined with prophecies of awful judgments, which are first to fall upon the nations for their apostacy, and to introduce a *new dispensation*.

Take that which I have just quoted from Habakkuk as an example. It is found in the midst of a description of various sins which are to prevail, (as pride, drunkenness, covetousness, ambition, and violence,) and is abruptly inserted, to encourage God's people to be assured that his glory shall ultimately prevail; and it is followed by a sublime description of God's going forth to thresh the heathen in his anger, and driving asunder the nations.

So the *little stone*, mentioned by Daniel, which was seen cut out of a mountain without hands, and afterwards became a great mountain and filled the whole earth, is applied in like manner, as setting forth the gradual augmentation of Christ's kingdom, by means of our missionary work. But the context shews, that, before this kingdom shall prevail, the stone is to smite the Gentile *image* (a symbol of the nations) on the feet and ten toes, and to smash the iron, the brass, the silver, and the gold together, making them as the chaff of the threshing-floor, which the wind carries away, so that no place is left for them. (Dan. ii.) I cannot conceive a more tremendous or extensive revolution; nor how a greater change can be effected in the political and religious aspect of the world!

Again, that passage is often referred to,—“So shall they fear the name of the Lord from the west, and his glory from the rising of the sun,”—as if it spake of the results of the present missionary labors: but note the context of this passage also; “For he put on righteousness as a breastplate, and a helmet of salvation upon his head; and he put on the garments of *vengeance* for clothing, and was clad with zeal as a cloak. According to their deeds, accordingly he will repay; fury to his adversaries, recompence to his enemies; to the islands [which means

Europe] he will repay recompence. So [it is added] shall they fear the name of the Lord from the west, and his glory from the rising of the sun ;"—shewing that not until the judgments of God are abroad in the earth "will the inhabitants of the world learn righteousness." (Isaiah lx. 19 ; xxvi. 9.) And in the next verse it is further added, "And the Redeemer shall come to Zion, and unto them that turn from transgression in Jacob, saith the Lord ;" which evinces that the advent in glory of the Redeemer is connected with the conversion of the world.

One example more :—It is the vision, described by St. John in Rev. xiv., of an angel flying in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting Gospel to preach to the nations, and kindreds, and tongues ; which is also applied to our present missionary agency, and I think it is with propriety so applied. Those, however, who bring forward this passage, generally end their quotation of it with the sixth verse, which describes the angel flying with the Gospel to all nations, and forget that he is further represented as saying to those nations, "with a loud voice, Fear God, and give glory to him, for the hour of his judgment is come." From which I understand, that when we see such a missionary agency at work in the world, (which we now manifestly do behold,) we are not to interpret it as a sign of *peace*, excepting only to those who shall receive "the Gospel of reconciliation : " to the world in general this sign proclaims, as with a *loud voice*, that the hour of judgment is at hand.

Nothing, indeed, can be clearer—whether we regard the context of Scripture in general, or that saying in particular of the Holy Ghost by the mouth of James, in the council of Jerusalem—than that God, in the first instance, visits the Gentiles, "to take out of them a people for his name." (Acts xv.) It is an *election* which God is now gathering, both from among the Jews and from among the Gentiles ;* and it is not until after this is completed that "the *fulness*" of both will be brought in, "*when the Lord shall return*, and build again the tabernacle† of David, which is fallen down ; that the *residue* of men (not then the election, but the *residue*) might seek after the Lord, even *all* the Gentiles, upon whom his name is called, saith the Lord, who doeth all these things.

[FOR THE AMERICAN MILLENNARIAN.]

NUMBER II.

MR. EDITOR:—In my last communication, I animadverted on "*the fundamental principle*" of interpretation, laid down by the N. Y. Observer, for the reading and study of the Scriptures. In effect, if not in words, it gives unbounded license to the *Imagination* to explain, not only

* The palm-bearing multitude described in Rev. vii. are also *out of* all nations, and kindreds, and peoples, and tongues ; and they appear conjointly with what would seem to be an election out of Israel, symbolized by a definite number of 12,000 sealed out of each tribe.

† In Psalm lxxviii. 67, the expression, *tabernacle* of Joseph, is explained to signify the *tribe* of Ephraim. The tabernacle of David must therefore signify the *family* or *dynasty* of David.

the prophetic, but other portions of, the sacred writings. There is much more danger, he intimates, from being *too literal* than *too figurative*. Western minds, we Americans, have so little poetry about us, that we are likely to mistake Metaphors for realities!! The Oriental mind, according to his shewing, was vastly superior to us, in this respect, abounding in rich and gorgeous imagery, dressing every thing off in the most splendid style, and expressing itself in the most grandiloquent terms, so that we, Americans, need to be cautioned how we mistake poetry for prose, tropes and figures for sober verities, and to be stimulated, by Reverend Editors and others, to look out for figures where we would not suspect them. How like is this to the whole Origin tribe of expositors! But we must say it is supremely ridiculous. Common people—who need not to study Rhetoric, in order to know, when language is figurative, and when it is not, much less to be instructed in the genius of Oriental poetry, and the characteristics of the Oriental mind—can readily detect the affectation and pedantry of some of our scholastic Doctors, Professors, Editors, and others, who are everlastingly prating about Orientalisms, and the extravagance, &c. of Hebrew poetry, as if the spirit of God had mistaken his own object, and forgotten that he was indicting the Bible for the whole world—for the western, as well as eastern mind, yea for the great and universal mass of common people, as well in the promises, which are but predictions, as in the preceptive and didactic parts of His word. Let these Hebraistic, poetastic, dogmatizing expositors, prove their assumptions. The realities which the word of God predict are beyond the utmost stretch of imagination. It is the denial of the fidelity of the prophet in giving a lively and accurate description, and the instituting an allegory, between events literally and visibly to occur in this world and the secret operations of the human mind and workings of the human heart, that has led them to render the language of the prophets sometimes wild, vague, confused, bombastic, unintelligible, worse than extravagantly puerile,—yea like Professor Stuart and some of his German authorities and Oracles, so to generalize and utterly deface all resemblance between the prophecy and the alleged fulfilment, as to make us think, if we did but believe them, after all what silly fellows and bombastic Orientalists the prophets were! We have no affinity whatever with them in the practical contempt which they do, virtually, we say not designedly, cast upon the prophetic writings,—yea and the very word of God. It may be fashionable, in certain quarters, to admire this tendency to theological refinement; but we loathe it from our inmost soul; and account all this boast of superior metaphysics, and discernment, and rational views, as part and parcel of the spawn of the Old Serpent, and one among the many indications which, every age, in some way or other, gives, that by wisdom THEY know not God who misinterpret his wisdom as foolishness and his promises and predictions as extravagant fanciful poetry.

The Editor of the N. Y. Observer has given, in the paragraph to which we referred in our last number, a general analysis of a little work on the

prophecies "a two-penny Tract, entitled Babylon," which has fallen into his hands, and which teaches, the literal return of the Jews to their own land, the literal reign of the Messiah on earth connected therewith, and the literal restoration of the Theocracy of Israel, together with the literal descent from Heaven of the New Jerusalem. We have not seen the work referred to, but admit that these are things which the faith of Millenarians does literally anticipate. On these points the Editor says nothing; but merely gives his statement of the writer's views. It seems that the writer denies the word Babylon can be legitimately, or is in fact used metaphorically as a designation of Rome, and therefore infers, from some predictions, that there are yet hardships and captivity to be endured by them in the ancient Babylon rebuilt, and that thence they are a second time to be delivered, and to find their way to Zion. Doubtless so the author of the "two-penny tract" thinks. Multitudes, both spiritualists and others have entertained wilder conceits: but what then? Why, says the Editor of the N. Y. Observer, "Probably this is a new idea even to the literalists of this country; but we do not well see how they can gainsay it." This is but an adroit and covert attempt to make it appear, that the system of interpretation, adopted by the literalists, as they are styled, leads, inevitably to absurdity.

Now the Editor, not being able to see how they can gainsay it, proves nothing, but his own ignorance. He must first shew that the principles of interpretation, adopted by them, and as applied to the passages referred to by the "two-penny tract" writer, do legitimately lead to such results. If the Editor is intending cautiously to play upon the meaning of the word **LITERAL**, it is unworthy of him. He is referred to the Dissertations on the Prophecies, by Rev. Geo. Duffield, to see what the principles of literal interpretation are. The question is, simply, is Babylon used by the prophets in these passages metaphorically or not? This can be ascertained by referring to the scope of their predictions and parallel prophecies. To insist and insinuate that the literalists, of necessity, exclude tropical expressions, and are compelled to take every word as devoid of all figure, is unbecoming. The Editor, however, is not going, in this way, to conceal the true issue. He may say, that if literalists admit tropical expressions this is just what spiritualists plead for, and where is the difference! Much every way. The spiritualist assumes a spiritual invisible state of things, peculiar to the mind and heart of men, and incapable of being expressed in any other than analogical or allegorical language, or, as Professor Stuart in his strictures on Mr. Duffield has it, "the world of mind" in contradistinction from "the world of matter," as the object and sphere of prophecy. Of course all such expressions as Zion, Jerusalem, the mountain of the Lord, the Heaven of the Lord, the kingdom of God, and indeed every term employed to denote the hidden actings of the intellect and heart, must be allegorically or spiritually understood. The literalist says, no. Whatever may be the import of analogical language, in reference to mental actings, and christian experience, that of prophecy is not such, because prophecy contemplates **VISIBLE REALITIES** transpiring or to transpire as historical events in this

world. The attempt to confound this, with the uniform literal import of particular expressions, is perfectly of a piece with the Editor's attempt, in such exceeding bad taste to excite a laugh and contempt, against Mr. Miller, by arithmetically calculating the numerical value of the letters, CAPTAIN MILLER.

VINDEK. 1

ON THE PRIESTHOOD OF CHRIST, AS IT SHALL BE EXERCISED
DURING AND AFTER THE MILLENNIUM.

WHEN our King shall return to take possession of his kingdom, "He shall sit and rule upon his throne, and he shall be a Priest upon his throne." Concerning the exercise of his kingly office, we have much set forth in the Scriptures: concerning his priestly office, as it shall be exercised during the Millennium, the details are fewer, and more scattered throughout the sacred volume; yet from the types and shadows of good things to come much may be learnt on this interesting subject. The following brief hints are thrown out, in the hope that they may lead some abler student of Prophecy to discuss it at greater length.

In prosecuting such an inquiry, the first question that naturally arises is, What is a priest? And this must be answered by a reference to what the holy Scriptures have revealed concerning priesthood in general. The first time we read of a priest, is in Gen. xiv., where we are introduced to the great type of our Kingly Priest, Melchizedek: "He was the priest of the most high God." And what did he in that capacity? He received from Abraham tithes of all, and bestowed on him the blessing of the most high God, whom he announced as the "Possessor of Heaven and Earth." Without going into the details of the Aaronic order of the priesthood, this first and highest order seems to give the simple and radical idea of a priest, which appears to be, a mediator—one who serves as the medium of communication between God and his worshippers; who presents the offerings of the latter, and dispenses the blessings of the former.

But a mediator presupposes some inability in the worshippers to approach God of themselves, and offer to Him immediately their tribute. We have no reason to suppose that the unfallen creature stood in need of a mediator, or that any thing prevented him from going directly to God; but since the Fall, man has needed a mediator in all his approaches to that great and holy Being with whom he has to do. There is enmity between man and his sovereign; the justice of the latter demands that the penalty of transgression should be paid; the fears of the former make him shrink from coming in contact with One whom they represent as a powerful enemy: and there needs "a daysman between them, that may lay his hands upon both."

The mediator must be either really, or by supposition and appointment, different from those for whom he mediates. The most natural idea of a mediator is, one who partakes of the nature both of the worshippers and of the Object of worship; the former is necessary, in or-

der that they may approach him ; the latter is necessary, in order that he may approach the Object of their worship. Such is the Great Mediator : " God and man, in two distinct natures and one person, for ever." All other priests were meant to represent him, and were solemnly set apart to this office by God's appointment : " No man taketh this honour unto himself but he that is called of God, as was Aaron" (Heb. v. 4). Before the separation of the family of Aaron, the head of a family or tribe seems to have officiated in this capacity. It is not said, indeed, that the offerings of Cain and Abel were presented by Adam : but it is probable, either that they were so, or that, at the time of the event recorded in Scripture, the two brothers were heads of separate households.

The nature of the priest's office may be further discerned from the manner in which they were installed into it. Their hands were filled : part of the sacrifice, with a loaf of bread, &c., were put into their hands ; which they waved, or lifted up, as presenting them to the Lord. But this was not done until, by laying their hands upon the head of the bullock for a sin-offering, they had transferred their guilt to it, and it was wholly burnt. Previous to this, again, they were anointed with oil ; perhaps this might signify the eternal predestination to the priestly office of Christ, and those whom He hath, by the outpouring of the Holy Spirit upon them elected to be " kings and priests unto God." The priest's union with the worshippers was signified by his eating the offerings. The offerer was considered as identifying himself with the offering ; the priest, by eating the offering, made it a part of himself, and thus was considered as one with the offerer. This principle of union, also, was exhibited on the day of his consecration by his eating flesh and bread at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation.

The nature of the various offerings mentioned in Scripture seems to have been but *twofold* : they were either expiatory or eucharistic. Many seem to overlook the latter sort of offerings, though they were far more numerous than the former. When a variety of offerings are commanded for the different festivals, in Num. xxviii., a kid *for a sin-offering* is specially mentioned at each ; thereby, surely, intimating that the rest were not sin-offerings, but thank-offerings, and tokens of allegiance to a Superior. On the day of atonement, whose rights were pre-eminently expiatory, it is expressly mentioned, that there is another sin-offering besides this kid—namely, the goat on which the people's lot fell (Num. xxix. 11). We may therefore infer, that at the other festivals this kid alone was considered as the expiatory offering. At all events, it must be admitted that the flour, the wine, the oil, the sweet spices, were not expiatory, but eucharistic ; and the burning of incense clearly was so.

Eucharistic offerings were always preceded by expiatory : " Without shedding of blood there was no remission of sins ;" and till sin was remitted, there was no approach to God. But while we diligently observe this peculiarity, let us not forget that the chief object of several of the festivals was eucharistic, not expiatory. Take, for example, the offer-

ing of first-fruits, Lev. xxiii. 9, &c. No bread, &c., could be used, till the offering of first-fruits had been brought to the priests, to be waved before the Lord : but with this sheaf of first-fruits was offered a lamb of a year old ; indicating, that this duty could not be performed, on account of the offerer's sinfulness, till an expiation was made. This may serve to illustrate several other feasts.

From a careful examination of these particulars, the following doctrine concerning eucharistic and expiatory sacrifices and offerings may be fairly deduced :—Man had been commanded to render unto the Lord a portion of the things of the earth which he possessed, in token that God is the true possessor of the whole, that from Him they are received and at his pleasure they are held. This is due to God, not as fallen creatures, but simply as creatures ; and is probably accompanied with praise and thanksgiving, the chief worship that would be required of a perfect human being. But the Fall placed the worshippers in different circumstances : it not only prevented him from approaching God without a Mediator, but he was borne down with a load of guilt, that prevented him from making any movement towards God till this load was taken away. For this purpose, One was appointed, on whom was laid the iniquity of us all : He paid the full penalty ; and in virtue of this, all those for whom it was paid are reckoned completely free from guilt. In token of this guilt being thus atoned for, by the penalty having been paid in the person of another, *sacrifices* were instituted ; which are proper to man, not as a *creature*, but as a *fallen creature*. *Gifts*, then, we owe to God as creatures ; but as sinners we are unable to offer gifts, sin having completely separated us from God and laid us under his curse ; *sacrifices*, therefore, we owe to Him as sinners, as a preliminary step to our offering him *gifts* as creatures.

Atonement, then, appears not to be an end in itself, but a mean to a further end. So “the spirits of just men made perfect” are represented as viewing it. In addressing the great Sacrifice, they say, “Thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood.” Here modern divines insist upon stopping : they think it derogatory to the great doctrine of the atonement to proceed further. So think not the spirits above ; for they proceed, “And hast made us unto our God kings and priests, and we shall reign on the earth.” The atonement is the purchase-money ; the redemption of the souls and bodies of the elect, and the inheritance of the earth, the glorious purchase. For we have not been redeemed “with corruptible things, as silver and gold, but with the precious blood of Christ ;” and we are now “sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise, which is the earnest of our inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession.”

But, to obtain further light on the priesthood of Christ, let us again advert to the observances of that law which was “a shadow of good things to come.” On the Day of Atonement, the high priest went into the holy place with the blood of the sacrifice : and Christ, our great High Priest, has entered, not into the holy place made with hands, but into Heaven itself, with his own blood. Though He was always pre-

destinatively a Priest, in the same sense as He was the "Lamb slain from the foundation of the world," yet his installation into the priestly office, if we may use the term, was an event which took place at a certain epoch of time, as well as the event of his death. The Scriptures distinctly fix this epoch. St. Paul declares his resurrection to be the manifestation of his Sonship (Rom. i. 4); explaining thereby that decree of the second Psalm, "Thou art my Son: this day have I begotten thee"—that is, at the time of his resurrection, when he appeared as the "first-begotten from the dead." Now the words of this decree are also declared elsewhere, by the same Apostle, to be that which constituted him a Priest (Heb. v. 4). From this it appears, that at his death he was the victim sacrificed for sin; at his resurrection, the high priest about to enter into the holy place with the blood of the victim—the presentation of his own atonement—in order that God might, on account of it, extend pardon and favor to his elect people. And as the Jewish high priest was wont, after the presentation of the blood of the sacrifice, to come forth to the people, and offer eucharistical burnt-offerings; so shall our great High Priest appear the second time, to them that look for him, to offer up, during a long day of joy and gladness, the tribute of thanks and praises from a redeemed world.

The more vividly to apprehend the priestly office of our King during his glorious reign on the earth, let us contemplate, so to speak, the first draught of God's purpose, as it appeared in the creative state. Let us view it, not as it appeared to the mind of Him who from all eternity decreed that it should be but a transient state, but as we may suppose it would appear to those principalities and powers in heavenly places to whom God makes known by the Church his manifold wisdom. They beheld a fair creation, which its Maker pronounced good; and saw it given in possession to holy beings, to whose various powers and faculties this good and fair creation was exactly adapted. From such a glorious commencement they would naturally anticipate that this earth should become the habitation of a multitude of happy beings, who would maintain a constant communion with the Author of their being, by the interchange of blessings and grateful adoration. And when they saw these fair expectations marred, and were told that by this very interruption a still more glorious state of things, would ultimately be brought about, no wonder, indeed, was it, that into this marvellous scheme of redemption the angels desired to look.

The Fall produced enmity between God and the creature; but God ordained One by whom he should "reconcile all things unto himself." The effects of this reconciliation will be a return to that state from which the creature fell; himself and his habitation redeemed from the curse, and holy intercourse with the infinite God renewed. Again shall the sunshine of God's countenance, and the dew of his blessing, exhale from the grateful earth the incense of praise; and all the glories of the creative state shall be restored. But if nothing more than the original glory were restored, the manifold wisdom of God in ordaining the Fall would not be displayed. What, then, is the grand difference between

the creation state and the redemption state? It is the priesthood of the Lord Jesus Christ: it is the Eternal Word having taken hold of the nature of Abraham's seed, and having joined it in everlasting union with his essential Divinity; thus forming a line between the creature and the Creator, and opening up a new and living way of close communion between them, to which the creation state had no access. They are one with Him who is one with the Father. Not only are they permitted to hold communion with the Almighty, but God in very deed dwells with them upon the earth, in the Second Person of the blessed Trinity. That great mystery, which Solomon imperfectly understood, and naturally marvelled at—how He whom the heaven of heavens could not contain should tabernacle amongst men—has now, by his incarnation, become a reality. Christ is "a Priest for ever, after the order of Melchizedek." Not only during the Millennial ages shall their King-Priest present to God the Father the adoration of a redeemed world; but through the ages of eternity the immediate Object of their worship shall be Himself their Fellow-worshipper; and, as the Beginning and Head of creation, shall for ever lift up the creature in the presence of the Father. To the worshippers, He is "the Image of the invisible God," "the fulness of the Godhead in a body;" and He stands before the great Object of their worship as the head and representative of the redeemed creature; as Him who hath "reconciled all things," by whom "all things consist," in whom "all things are gathered into one:" thus, like Aaron with the names of the tribes of Israel upon his shoulders, bearing the creature before the Lord for an everlasting memorial.

And thus, throughout eternity, shall the great work of redemption be kept in remembrance. The glorified humanity of the Lord Jesus Christ shall be an eternal monument of the mighty work accomplished by the Word being made flesh. Even when he shall have subdued all things to himself, and shall deliver up the kingdom to his Father, there exists a memorial of all he has done. "Then shall the Son also be subject to him who put all things under him." He shall, as the Head of the creature, tell out the manifold wisdom of God in the creation, the fall, and the redemption of man, by his eternal subjection, as man, to his Father and their Father, to his God and their God. s. x.

[COMMUNICATION.]

A sketch of a closing part of a Speech, delivered by an Episcopal Minister, from Philadelphia, the Rev. Dr. TYNG, before the American Bible Society, at the Broadway Tabernacle, May 11th, 1843.

"The diffusion of the English Bible is, beyond all doubt, the great means to which we are to look for the ushering in of that day which all Christians await; and we trust that the time shall ere long come when that same Bible shall be received as the law of nations. *In that glorious day, when Christ himself will be their King,—(I fully believe in the personal reign of Christ here upon earth, when all nations shall meet to do him homage, and all questions of division will be forgotten in the majesty of truth,)*—the Bible itself will produce these effects—all else will be found to be but the

single bell, or pomegranite upon the breasts of the Priests, which, though they may faintly reflect the light which shines upon them, are after all, only the outward part of the man who wears them."

As a short speech is listened to more attentively, and has a more thrilling effect than a long one, and as Dr. Tyng made a very short and pathetic one, we very much regret to see that the Editor of the New York Observer, in May 20th, did leave out the most eloquent and most prominent part of it, though he printed the rest entire; but the part relating to the glorious reign of Christ on earth, that part of the above speech printed in Italicks, was left out. Why was that part left out? Not because of the length, sure?—Why and for what reason was this grand central part left out? Circumstances compel me to believe that there are many professed Christians, who are in open hostility to the personal reign of Christ here upon earth, and had rather things would remain as they are, than to have the wicked become like ashes, (Malachi, iv. 3;) the earth and all the inhabitants purified, and to hear that glorious Jubilee, ALL HAIL THE LORD OUR KING.

AN EPISCOPALIAN.

TO OUR SUBSCRIBERS.

THE first Number of Volume 2d, was sent to all those Subscribers to Volume 1st, who had not previously signified their intention to discontinue, with the request that they would return it, provided such was their intention. We have received a few Numbers returned, by whom we know not, no name accompanying the paper. We respectfully request all those who send the Numbers back to write their names and places of residence upon them, that we may know what names to erase from our Subscription List. Those who continue will please remember the terms of Subscription, \$1 per year, payable in advance.

THE following Works are for sale, at the Office of the Millenarian, 138 Fulton Street:

BEGGS' CONNECTED VIEW OF PROPHECY.

PYMS' WORD OF WARNING.

ONE SET OF THE LITERALIST, ENTIRE.

REVIEW OF GEO. STORRS, ON THE RETURN OF THE JEWS.

DAVID'S THRONE.

Also, in Press and shortly to appear, INTERPRETATION OF OLD TESTAMENT PROPHECIES QUOTED IN THE NEW, by Rev. E. Irving.

ANDERSON'S APOLOGY FOR MILLENARIAN DOCTRINE.

A SOBER INQUIRY; OR, CHRIST'S REIGN, &c.

AGENTS.

THE following persons are authorized to act as Agents, in receiving Subscriptions and Moneys for this Paper, viz:

Orrin Rogers, Philadelphia.

A. Merrick, Boston.

Jas. B. Wilson, Cincinnati.

Rev. D. L. Proudfit, Newburgh.

Jno. Jordan, Watertown, N. Y.

Elisha Putnam, Albany.

M. Safford, Norwich, Ct.

H. L. Burdick, Scott, Cort'and, Co., N. Y.

Dr. S. Baker, Newtown, Bucks Co., Pa.

Joseph W. Horr, Mount View, Davidson Co., Tenn.

Alex. McFerren, Detroit, Mich.

Alfred B. Burdick, Hopkinton and West-erly, R. I.

J. C. Burdick, Hartford, Conn.

Joseph Levon, Travelling Agent.

